

Regional Services Council Meeting—Region 14
12/20/05

- IV-B Allocations (handout)—page 1 represents 1.5 years of funding and page 2 represents 1 year
- Part 1 will be retained in Central Office, possibly for retaining local attorneys in certain county offices, Foster Parent Training (RFP), Training of FCMs and Supervisors, and MSW/BSW programs.
- IV-E FC penetration rate affects IV-B allocations—as penetration rate increases, more IV-B \$ available to the State
- Proposals are due 12/22. Regional committee will review final recommendations. Local teams (Directors and Supervisors) will conduct their own county review first and prepare recommendations.
- Open Door Law applies to ALL RSC meetings.
- DCS Regional Managers will assure consistency in the review/scoring process Statewide.
- Reviewers need to be familiar with the 379 questions/answers on the website.
- Proposals will be mailed to County Office, Regional Manager, and IV-B Coordinator. Coordinators will review proposals and be in contact w/providers.
- The initial timeline indicates counties will have from 1/20/06 through 1/27/06 to review proposals, but it is recognized that more time may be necessary. Counties may start their reviews as proposals are received.
- What are some future tasks for the RSC? Suggestions as follows:
 1. Are we pleased (regionally) with services?
 2. Do we need additional services? (When additional services are needed, the Council can put out its own RFP; MB Lippold will assist in this process. MB would like to visit RSC meetings, so she may attend in February/March/April depending upon scheduling.
 3. Quality Assurance (QA) and its role within RSC: Central Office is looking to eventually use regional teams for future QA processes.
 4. Can the RSC look at Coordinator Summaries (providers) at a RSC meeting?
 5. Regarding County Councils—is there anything we can do as a group to improve the relationship and/or to partner in some way?
 6. Judges/Partners/Practice Model/Principles
 7. It was suggested that an email summary be provided to the other Judges.
 8. Strategic Planning approach as opposed to a more reactive approach as a long-term goal.
- Providers in attendance provided feedback regarding the RFP process as follows:
 1. Providers feel the process was unorganized.
 2. Providers voiced concern as they weren't quite sure if they had everything they needed for submission.
 3. Providers voiced concern over the timeline for submission and sufficient time was not given to provide a quality product.

4. Providers voiced concern that Central Office's timeline was lengthened, but the timeline for providers was not extended.
 5. Providers suggested a pilot for 1.5 years rather than locking in for 2.5 years.
 6. Providers voiced concern over the overwhelming budget involved with a 2.5-year cycle.
- The next meeting of the RSC will be held on 1/17/06 @ 8:30 AM at the Bartholomew Co DCS Conference Room.
 - The RSC will meet on 02/06/06, beginning @ 9:00 am, at the Bartholomew County DCS conference room. Purpose of this meeting is to finalize the recommendations on which proposals to approve for services.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Medler, Director
Shelby County DCS/DFR